



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,864	09/09/2003	Roger M. Snow	PA0912.ap.US	5191
75035 7590 06/07/2011 Mark A> Litman and Associates, P.A. York Business Center 3209 w. 76th Street Suite 205 Edina, MN 55435				
EXAMINER				
LAYNO, BENJAMIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3711				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/07/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 *The above entitled matter came on for oral hearing on*
2 *Thursday, February 10, 2011, commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent*
3 *and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Lori*
4 *Allen, Notary Public.*

5
6 JUDGE PATE: Good morning, Mr. Litman.

7 MR. LITMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. How are you
8 today?

9 JUDGE PATE: We're good. Thank you. We have had a
10 chance to look at this case beforehand, we think we are up to speed on the
11 technology, and we'd like to hear your arguments concerning patentability.

12 MR. LITMAN: Very good. May it please the Court, the
13 technology here is a variation in the wagering capability and the method of
14 playing a casino table card game.

15 The critical element in this claim that distinguishes over the
16 prior art is the fact that the player gets a player hand. A bonus hand is also
17 dealt that is available to the player. The player places a side bet bonus
18 wager. That bonus wager action is independent of the underlying play of the
19 game.

20 The side bet wager functions as follows: if the player's hand
21 has at least a predetermined rank, he immediately wins a bonus amount.
22 Having won that bonus amount, the bonus hand is then revealed, and if that
23 bonus hand also exceeds a second independent predetermined amount, the
24 first bonus amount won on the bonus bet by the player is increased.

1 The player first has to win a bonus, but if he wins a bonus, he's
2 guaranteed that initial bonus on the bonus bet, and then he has the
3 opportunity of having that bonus increased on the bonus bet if the bonus
4 hand is also larger.

5 Burnelle teaches a game in which first there is an underlying
6 game between the player and the dealer. He can win or lose, doesn't matter.
7 He can also qualify for a bonus event, but he does not win any bonus amount
8 on the bonus bet in that initial play with the player hand.

9 Therefore, Burnelle is missing a functional first step in the
10 claims that are recited here on appeal, winning the first bonus amount. That
11 is important because then he cannot possibly increase the bonus amount
12 because he does not have a bonus amount won on the initial cards.

13 The Examiner then cites Burnelle is also not a poker game, and
14 once he qualifies, then he can win an amount on the bonus bet in the bonus
15 hand.

16 Jones shows a game in which you place a bonus bet on your
17 poker hand. You either win the bonus or don't win the bonus. There is no
18 additional bonus, no modification of that bonus bet with a subsequent hand.

19 There is a genuine functional difference here in that neither
20 reference shows two actions on a single bonus bet ignoring the underlying
21 game. There is no reason to add from the teachings in the art or knowledge
22 in the art two distinct bonus events occur based on a single bonus bet.

23 There is absolutely nothing that would give instruction or
24 reason or obviousness to adding multiple events to the single bet when it's

1 not known in the art, there is no exemplification leading to that.

2 The fundamental combination of the Examiner fails to provide
3 any basis for finding obviousness and adding two bonus steps to a single
4 bonus event wherein if the player wins the initial bonus, he's guaranteed that
5 bonus, and the only thing that can happen after that is if the bonus hand is
6 also a quality hand, increasing that initial bonus.

7 That is the fundamental underlying basis for obviousness in this
8 case. The two references are diverse in what they are doing, and even if you
9 combine them, there is nothing in the combination of the teachings that
10 would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to deal a player one hand for play
11 against an underlying game, and then have a bonus hand available wherein a
12 bonus bet has an effect both on the player hand initially winning a bonus and
13 possibly an enhanced bonus, if the bonus hand is also larger.

14 There is no combination of elements in the reference that could
15 possibly be used to lead to that method step.

16 JUDGE PATE: I think I understand your argument. Do you
17 have any questions, Judge Silverberg, Judge Staicovici?

18 (No response.)

19 JUDGE PATE: Okay. I don't think we have any more
20 questions for you. We are going to take this case under advisement.

21 MR. LITMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.

22 JUDGE PATE: Thank you, sir.

23 (Whereupon, at 9:05 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)

24 * * * * *